THEOLOGY

OL. L MARCH, 1947 No. 321

Editorial

THE sensational title of the book *Is the Roman Catholic Church a cret Society?* (Watts and Co., 2s.), by J. V. Simcox, Warren Sandell d Raymond Winch, and the attachment to it of an advertisement the Rationalist Press Association, ought not to be allowed to dis- ise the facts that it is written by *bona fide* Roman Catholics and at it raises a question of considerable public interest. The recent mpaign of the Romanists in England on behalf of their schools was nducted on the ground that parents have a natural right to educate eir children according to their conscience. The Rev. J. V. Simcox, ho was Professor of Canon Law at St Edmund's College, Ware, r twenty-three years until November, 1944, maintains that this octrine of parental rights is not the doctrine of the Roman Church, though he wishes it were. In a letter to *The Catholic Herald*, he asked: From the Catholic point of view, does the argument from parental ghts continue to hold even when the parents are in religious error d wish their children to be taught this error?"

He points out that the authoritative teaching of the Roman Church that the argument from parental rights does not hold when the rents are in what is (from its point of view) religious error, and that is teaching has never been abrogated or disowned. It therefore ap- ars that the Roman Catholic propaganda in the education campaign 1942 and 1943 was dishonest. This book contains a record of the ntroversy that was provoked by Professor Simcox's inquiry. Both rdinal Hinsley and Cardinal Griffin as well as some lesser lights ed to make him desist from asking what was evidently to them a ry embarrassing question.

Though Roman Catholic ecclesiastics are capable of great ingenuity, is difficult to see how they could or can answer this question without knowledging that either they themselves or the Church which they present had been in error. If the question at issue were purely eculative, it might be regarded with indifference, but since it bears rectly on the principle of toleration and the constitution of a free vil society, it should serve as a warning against supposing that the man Church has abandoned its traditional teaching except where r the time being it has seemed politically opportune to do so.

* * * * * *

The sudden death in January of Professor Karl Mannheim constitutes substantial loss to England, although he was not an Englishman cept by naturalization, and to English Christians, although he was t a Christian in any strict sense of the term. Since he came to England had assimilated to an extraordinary degree the English tradition, d had discovered, as few Englishmen have, the strengths and the aknesses of contemporary English society. Both of them he pointed

out insistently (but never offensively), because like many continentals he believed that Great Britain has a unique responsibility for the future welfare of mankind. He believed that Britain has the opportunity of showing the world how to combine "planning" with "freedom," and in his books and lectures he was never tired of showing what an immense task this would be, nor of claiming that it could be achieved. It would not be achieved by taking things for granted nor by muddling through, but only by the discovery and affirmation of a national purpose and a national mission. His books are probably difficult reading for those who had not heard him speak, but they continue to repay close and imaginative study.

Professor Mannheim, though his work as a sociologist required him to keep on the empirical level, was far from being a secularist. No one realized more keenly that there are depths in man's existence which neither science nor politics can plumb. He saw that the crisis of our time is at bottom moral, spiritual, theological. Hence his appeal in *Diagnosis of our Time* to theologians to "come over and help us." We shall find that he was asking us questions which we shall have to answer and that he assigned to us a responsibility from which we cannot escape. He gave Christian thought the credit of expecting far more of it that it has at present to show, far more humility and self-purgation, certainly, but also far more daring and passion.

The Apostolic Ministry—I

"WHERE present controversies are bound up so closely with questions of history, it is difficult in the extreme to be sure that one has seen the facts oneself without prejudice, and almost impossible to convey them to the reader in the exact proportion that one understands them without their being interpreted by his prejudices without his knowledge." These words from *The Shape of the Liturgy* provide a good *caveat lector* for *The Apostolic Ministry*[1] and any review of it. Here where both history and theology are bound up with present controversy and with each other, impartiality is impossible and justice not easy.

I. An apology for the necessity of episcopacy in apostolic succession must prove either that the succession has been maintained or that on the evidence, the *onus probandi* lies on those who deny it. That a episcopal succession was preserved from about A.D. 150 is certain and the earlier observance of some principle of ministerial succession highly probable, though its meaning, and the significance of exceptions, may be debated. Through whom, then, was the early succession preserved? Through bishops proper? But, it is said, in the New Testament as in other early writings, *episcopos* and *presbyter* are the same man; succession, if any, was presbyteral. Against this Dr Farrer fights a desperate rearguard action, struggling to weaken the widely accepted equivalence and reaching at best a *non liquet*. On many points

[1] Edited by the Bishop of Oxford. Hodder and Stoughton. £2 2s.

owever, his colleagues do not support him. They rest their case nd here Dr Farrer agrees) not on early monepiscopacy but on disnctions between (*a*) the office of presbyter and the function of *iscope*, and (*b*) the essential and dependent ministries. Presbyters first depended on apostles. If they ordained, before the threefold inistry became fixed, they were the representatives for the time being the essential ministry (Dr Kirk, p. 14). This was no less true of e first monepiscopoi—*e.g.*, of Asia. Early episcopoi, collegiate or onarchical, belong properly to the dependent ministry. Thus the oscure problem of emerging monepiscopacy is set aside as relatively nimportant. In Dr Farrer's words (p. 171), "the bishops were rovidentially prepared to become apostolic." Before the second ntury closed, the bishop held an office combining apostolic functions, articularly ordination, with others inherited from the earlier presbyter overnment) and episcopos (liturgical). How this happened and how resbyters exchanged some functions with bishops in the fourth cenry belongs to the administrative history of the ministry which is orked out by Dom Gregory Dix and Dr Jalland. Their reconstruction as full of interest as of difficulties. Although it is not theologically nimportant, since it is intended to dismiss presbyterian claims, must concentrate here on the vital question of apostolic authority.

The third-century bishop, it is claimed, is a true successor of the postles. Between him and them come, apart from any earlier aposlic bishops, a number of apostolic men, not themselves local episcopoi not merely such. Dr Kirk states the proposition as a fact (p. 10), Each local church came under the supervision of a resident 'successor the Apostles,' himself ordained to the position by those who already eld the same rank." Now these apostolic men are, historically, ae crucial difficulty. The evidence is scarce, problematical (*e.g.*, date nd nature of Pastorals and Didache) and ambiguous (I Clem. 0-44). Certainly we cannot omit the Twelve from the picture of ae New Testament ministry; certainly other outstanding men (some alled apostles) appear—*e.g.*, James, Timothy, the *ellogimoi* of Clement, erhaps some prophets. Dr Farrer and Dom Dix would add, with arying degrees of hesitancy, such leaders as Clement himself, Igatius and Polycarp. The brute fact remains that we do not know nat such men were always ordained in succession, we do not know hat commission they received, whether they took care to maintain succession other than presbyteral and whether presbyters were rdained only by such men. Do the Pastorals portray a typical or n exceptional case? We do not know. Ignatius says nothing of piscopal succession. If Clement tells us of *ellogimoi* and of ordination y them, he does not confine ordination to them or place them in a uccession. The tendency of this book is to dismiss exceptions as nimportant, to take existing evidence as typical (except the Didache) nd to claim that there is no evidence (except the Didache) against is case. Admitting the difficulties and the absence of evidence or the second century, Dom Dix holds that there is enough continuity o throw the onus of disproof upon his opponents. I cannot believe nat the sense of justice of most readers will think that good enough,

when so much is at stake theologically. A case for early supervision by something more than local city-bishops might be made out, but that is not sacramental succession. The historical basis of apostolic succession is imperilled, not strengthened, when it is dissociated from the presbyter-episcopos. While even there we are not on firm ground, at least we know that some apostles appointed some elders, and that presbyters were normally ordained by men holding some office. On that basis, Dr Kirk's statement that presbyters who ordain belong to the essential ministry is reasonable; on the other it is a subterfuge.

If, however, we return to the presbyteral succession, the problem of early monepiscopacy, so conveniently shelved, returns to the foreground. And so it should, for Dom Dix's argument that true bishops were never ordained by their own local ministry necessarily rests on no evidence prior to monepiscopacy, given which, the bishop is appropriately consecrated by his peers. Again, the more dubious the functions of apostolic men, the more important are the functions of early presbyters. Though the distinction of office (elder) from function (episcope) is legitimate as an abstraction, there is something of legerdemain in the way functions are tossed about from one real man to another. The first presbyters admittedly exercised episcope, including liturgical functions; and again the evidence for the less-liturgical presbyter postdates monepiscopacy (which explains it, in a small congregation) and cannot prove that liturgical functions are not part and parcel of the Christian presbyterate. It is unfair to stress the Jewish-Christian likeness when convenient and to pass over any inconvenient unlikeness.

Before I plunge into theology, I must recur to the inadequacy of the evidence at *every* point in the early history of the ministry. Look at a few pages of Dr Farrer's essay: p. 149, more likely . . . very likely (of two different points); p. 150, might easily, could easily, would, would be; p. 152, one might expect, not necessarily; p. 153, we might suppose. I admire his ingenuity; lack of evidence compels speculation. But you cannot base dogma on a string of suppositions.

II. The principal theological arguments are familiar enough—the givenness of the ministry, the necessity of a divine commission in order to represent Christ to the Church, visible continuity of ministry as an organ of the Church's continuity. So Dr Kirk asks (p. v), "Has [the ministry] a commission transmitted in orderly sequence from the Lord Himself, or is it commissioned simply and solely by the congregation of believers among whom the minister is to serve?" The antithesis is unfair, for it sets out the opposite extremes of a number of possibilities as if they exhausted them. Many Protestants believe that a minister must be commissioned from above, sent by God. It is precisely that "transmission in orderly sequence," which has to be proved necessary to a divine commission. Full discussion being impossible here, let us ask how three matters are handled; (i) the nature of the apostolic commission, (ii) the tactual or "pipe-line" theory of a transmission of grace, and (iii) the efficacy of non-episcopal ministries.

(i) It is argued that *apostolos* and *apostellein* imply *shaliach*, plenipotentiary. Now, the variety of senses of *shaliach* and *apostellein* in the ible, and the variety of Jewish *shelihim* revealed by the sources to hich we are referred, should caution us against giving them a more recise sense than "sent," when applied to the Christian ministry. vertones it may set going, but these are not legislative. If we ask ho are the Apostles' plenipotentiaries and in what sense, the reply confused. Presbyters and apostolic men share their functions. reaching and many aspects of government (highly essential functions f the real Apostles) are allowed to presbyters—but they are not therefore *shelihim*, not essential ministers; whereas the Celtic monastic ishop, who does not govern, need not teach, and simply ordains t the Abbot's dictate, is a *shaliach*, a plenipotentiary of the Lord, a ue heir of the Apostles! In fact, the book allows that the full position f apostle cannot be transmitted; their successors are not to that extent *helihim*. On the other hand the reduction of the essential "shaliachate" o the power of ordaining admits a minimal conception of episcopacy more useful to those who, once ordained, would flout authority than o the good government and true apostolicity of the Church. Dom Dix need not be so surprised that so hazy a word has not played a arger part in recent Anglican discussion (though he has overlooked W. L. Clarke in *Episcopacy, Ancient and Modern*).

(ii) Is the "pipe-line" theory of a transmitted grace of orders abandoned or not? The tendency of the book is to stress authority, not grace, which many will welcome; but no clean break is made. Dr Kirk would not "lay much theological stress upon the laying on of hands" (p. 16), but holds that "we have no alternative but to receive the agelong traditions" (p. 40). Why not? If I receive them *qua* ancient, is he really satisfied? As Dr Farrer shows (though I think he overworks his method) Old Testament conceptions of ministry, much of it connected with "hands," penetrated early Christian thinking. What is the authority of ideas so received? Again Dom Dix (p. 200) says that Anglicans seem agreed to repudiate transmission "like a contagion"; may we not know clearly whether he and his colleagues repudiate it? But Miss Ady (p. 459) affirms that "the belief that a bishop is necessary for the transmission of the grace of orders is explicit both in its [the Church of England's] formularies and in its corporate action."

(iii) The point merges with my third, non-episcopal ministries. Discussing validity, Dr Kirk allows them spiritual efficacy (p. 37), but not *full* efficacy (p. 39). "If this Church disappears the gospel sacraments as efficacious signs of grace disappear with it." What of this *if*? Has it disappeared? Have the free churches gospel sacraments or mere simulacra? "Without the succession," he says, "the ministry is no ministry." Dom Dix allows Reformed ministers full ancient episcope; they can celebrate the Lord's Supper. Is this an efficacious Eucharist or not? For "the episcopate is the only means by which our Lord's commission to stand in His Person before God and man is given afresh to each new minister of His Church" (p. 303). Miss Hamilton Thompson (p. 406), sums up "the official attitude" of the

Elizabethan Church as no bishop, no Church. While Bishop Mackenzie speaks of non-episcopal Churches, Fr Hebert (p. 525) asserts that though a local Christian community in which no one is entitled to claim obedience in Christ's name may be quite a good religious club it cannot be the Church of God. Are the free churches only clubs? Or, if their ministers can claim obedience in Christ's name, whence have they that authority?

The essayists are clear that non-episcopal ministries are invalid; about their efficacy they are, in my opinion, considerably muddled. If so, their difficulty may reflect upon their own doctrine. They generously recognize that Protestant beliefs are not merely perverse, that it is not easy, though it is necessary, to hold the doctrines of the Church and the Ministry together, that within the New Testament there is real tension at this point. Even so, they fail, I think, to do justice to non-successional views. When apostolic episcopacy is tied to succession by consecration (historically unproved), the theological difficulties about "free" ministries are inevitable and lead either to confused concessions or untenable harshness. This book rightly distrusts the acceptance of an historic episcopate without theology. But is their theology the only alternative which preserves apostolicity? Is there no possibility of a bishop, heir to the Apostles in many of his functions, sent by Christ, charged above others with the maintenance of faith and order, a minister of the whole Church, the acknowledged minister of ordination, conferring ecclesiastical authority on behalf of the Church upon those whom he ordains (bishop and presbyter) who yet, like the presbyter, receives his divine commission, not via the succession but directly from Christ at his own consecration in response to the prayer of the Church (*cf.* Hippolytus's consecration prayer)? If there is a succession by ordination, we may value it; but the essential succession is the continuity of the Church itself (*cf.* the apostolic succession of Irenæus and Tertullian). Against Augustine, there can be no ordination *extra ecclesiam*; but with Augustine, the true minister of the divine commission at ordination is Christ Himself. *We* cannot tie Him to any human succession; and there is no sufficient evidence that He so tied Himself. As He sent the Apostles, so He can send others.

In the second part of this article I will deal with some points of detail.

S. L. Greenslade.

Second-Century Teaching on Holy Baptism

Recent discussion of the theology of Confirmation in relation to Holy Baptism, and in particular the lecture under this title delivered at Oxford by Dom Gregory Dix, has drawn attention to a distinction between water-baptism, connected with the remission of sins, and the baptism of the Spirit, associated with the laying on of the bishop's hand and the unction which immediately followed the water-baptism. The *De Baptismo* of Tertullian (*c.* 200) and the *Apostolic Tradition of*

ppolytus, for example, witness notably to this distinction, and these ly documents have been given much prominence. Further, Fr Dix s also drawn attention to the application (as he would maintain) 'Hippolytus' and other ancient liturgies of the expression 'seal' the 'baptism of the Spirit,' and has underlined its significance. document," he says (p. 21), "which needs 'sealing' is not valid til the seal has been affixed." Whatever efficacy, therefore, water-ptism effected, it was the sealing—the baptism of the Spirit—that lly mattered and gave significance and validity to the rite as a ole.

An important question, especially for members of the Anglican mmunion, is how far the two documents referred to represent the ptismal teaching of the second century and the closing years of the st. Fr Dix appears to be satisfied that the liturgical tradition they body goes back to apostolic times, and that "the scattered Gentile urches adhered pretty rigidly throughout the second century" to it . 10). It is just this point, as it seems to me, which calls for further amination.

Separation between water-baptism and baptism of the Spirit is fficult to reconcile with the phrase ' of water and Spirit' (*ex hudatos i pneumatos*) in John iii, 5. "*Hudatos kai*," says Bernard, "are not to regarded as representing precisely the saying of Jesus. They are ie to a restatement by John of the original saying of v. 3, and are a oss, added to bring the saying of Jesus into harmony with the belief nd practice of a later generation." As such they are very relevant r giving us an insight into the baptismal theology of the end of the rst century. Again, even if we do not regard the 'baptismal formula' Matthew xxviii, 19 as containing the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord, any rate it gives us a similar insight; and as the words probably ean "baptized into the possession of the Father and of the Son and the Holy Spirit" (see Moulton and Milligan,*s .v. onoma*),[1] they dicate a conception of water-baptism different from and richer than iat of Tertullian.

Fr Dix interprets other early evidence in accordance with Tertullian nd 'Hippolytus,' as for example "Ignatius' statement that 'without ne Bishop it is not *possible* (*ouk exon*) to baptize' or St Paul's phrase nto one Spirit were we all baptized'" (p. 15). Probably the Pauline eference is to 1 Cor. xii, 13 "In one Spirit were we all baptized into ne body"—which is not quite the same thing. A more correct trans-ation of Ignatius (*ad. Smyrn.* viii) would be that given by Lightfoot: "It is not lawful apart from the bishop to baptize." It is not the presence f the Bishop at baptism that is essential; but baptism must come within ne ambit of his authority; it must not be schismatical or heretical n character. The opening words of the section are significant: "Shun livisions, as the beginning of evils." Fr Dix's handling of this passage eems all the more puzzling because in *The Shape of the Liturgy*, p. 84, ne translates it "Without the bishop it is not lawful. . . ."; and on

[1] *Cp.* also F. W. Green, in the *Clarendon Bible*, *ad. loc.*: "the baptized may be said o be translated into the possession of the Father, Jesus Christ, and His Spirit at that noment operative in the fullness of the Divine activity in the Christian community."

p. 99, with reference to the same context in Ignatius, he says, "Anyone *can* baptize or hold an agape 'without the bishop' "—apparently the opposite of what he says in his lecture.

The two second-century descriptions of Holy Baptism that we possess, in the *Didache* and in Justin Martyr, are very different from those of Tertullian and 'Hippolytus.' They describe a rite of water-baptism which is complete in itself and appears to be regarded by the writers as such. True, in Justin the newly baptized person is immediately after baptism brought into the assembly of the faithful (*Apol.* i, 65), where the brethren "offer common prayers for themselves and for him who has been enlightened and for all the other (brethren) everywhere"; and then, after the kiss of peace, the president celebrates the Eucharist. But the words quoted above are not patient of the interpretation that some have placed upon them, namely, that they refer to further baptismal ceremonies. It is to be noted that the newly baptized person does not come first in the list of those prayed for. He simply takes a place among the number of the brethren, and is prayed for particularly only because he is a new member of the brotherhood. Justin's theology of the baptism he describes in his *Apology* may be gathered from what he says in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, chap. xxix: "What need have I of that other baptism (*i.e.* circumcision), who have been baptized with the Holy Spirit?" We may compare with this the words of Irenæus, *Dem.* 41: "These were the Apostles, who after [receiving] the power of the Holy Spirit were sent forth by him into all the world, and wrought the calling of the Gentiles . . . cleansing their souls and bodies by the baptism of water and of the Holy Spirit." *Ib.* 42: "For such is the state of those who have believed, since in them continually abides the Holy Spirit, who was given by him in baptism, and is retained by the receiver, if he walks in truth and holiness and righteousness."

In view of the present discussion it is important to examine the use of the term 'seal' (*sphragis*, *sphragizo*) with reference to Holy Baptism in second-century documents. Let me try to give the evidence as succinctly as possible.

(1) In the *Shepherd* of Hermas, *Sim.* ix, 16. 4 we read: "The seal, then, is the water. They go down then into the water dead, and come up alive." This seal, we are told, some have received, but have broken it, and have not 'kept' it whole (*Sim.* viii, 6. 3). If the Muratorian fragment is correct, Hermas was brother to Pius who was bishop of Rome, *c.* 140 to *c.* 155, and the *Shepherd* was written during his brother's tenure of the See. Some scholars, however, put the *Shepherd* nearer the beginning of the century. In any case we have here a use of 'seal' by a writer connected with the Church of Rome which is quite different from its use in 'Hippolytus,' for it is definitely connected with water-baptism. For the emphasis upon water-baptism in this writer, see also the statement in *Vis.* iii, 3: "The tower (*i.e.*, the Church) has been built upon the water, because your life was saved, and shall be saved through water."

(2) 2 *Clement* is a homily generally dated before or after 150, and variously connected with Rome, Corinth or Alexandria. From

comparison of chapters vi, vii and viii, it is clear that 'baptism' called 'the seal'; and we are exhorted to 'keep' it 'pure,' 'undefiled,' nspotted.' *Cp.* the second reference to Hermas above. The most atural reference of the term 'seal' is to water-baptism, inasmuch as was especially associated with the renunciation of evil and purity life. But even if the reference is wider, that is, to the baptismal rite a whole, it must certainly include and lay special emphasis upon aptism in the water.

(3) *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, 25 (*c.* 160): ed. M. R. James, p. 277, Thecla said: Only give me the seal in Christ, and temptation shall ot touch me. And Paul said: Have patience, Thecla, and thou alt receive the water."

(4) The recently discovered *Homily on the Passion* by Melito of ardis (died before 190) uses the word 'sealed' three times (ed. C. onner, p. 95) of Moses' sprinkling the door posts with the blood the lamb. The editor notes: "The word is used because the sprinkng of the doors, being a mark of divine protection, suggested baptism." wing to a lacuna in the Greek papyrus of the *Homily*, we do not know hat word Melito used in speaking of the application of the blood to ne door posts: it may have been 'smear' (*chrisete*), as a Coptic fragment ould suggest, or it may have been 'dip' (*bapsete*), as in LXX of Exod. ii, 22. It seems, therefore, that either chrism or water-baptism is the eal.' In a later passage (p. 131) Melito says that the Incarnate hrist "sealed our souls with his own Spirit and the members of the ody with his own blood."

(5) Irenæus, *Dem.* 3, says that "baptism for the remission of sins, n the name of God the Father and in the name of Jesus Christ . . . nd in the Holy Spirit of God . . . is the seal of eternal life." Clearly ere 'baptism' includes, if it is not indeed limited to, water-baptism, hich was associated especially with the forgiveness of sins.

(6) Clement of Alexandria (*c.* 150-*c.* 215) represents a later stage. he term 'seal' occurs in (*a*) *Strom.* ii, 3; (*b*) *Strom.* v, 11. 73. 2; (*c*) *Exrpta ex Theodoto*, lxxx; (*d*) *ib.* lxxxvi; (*e*) *Eclogæ Propheticæ*, 12. 9. f these (*a*) refers to the laying on of hand or the sign of the cross, fter the baptism in water; (*d*) to the sign of the cross; (*b*) and (*c*) to ne moment of immersion or the sign of the cross afterwards; (*e*) to ne laying on of hand or to the baptismal rite as a whole (see Tollinton, , 140ff.). But there is a sixth passage (*f*) *Quis Dives*, 42. 4 in which he set over him the perfect guard, the seal of the Lord" is the equivalent f "he enlightened (*ephotise*) him" in the previous clause. This is the ell-known passage which tells the story of St. John and the young bber, *in which Clement is clearly using material of an early date* (note at in it *episcopos* and *presbyteros* are interchangeable terms).

(7) The uses of the term by Tertullian are suggestive. Fr Dix p. 14) says "For Tertullian . . . it is not the water but 'the seal' which nparts the Spirit." This statement is very misleading. It is true at according to Tertullian we do not receive the Holy Spirit in the ater (*De Baptismo* vi); but on the other hand we should not gather om Fr Dix's words the interesting fact that Tertullian clearly applies ne term 'seal' to baptism in water. (*a*) *De Præscriptione* xxxvi (*c.* 200):

The Church 'seals it (*i.e.* faith) with water' (*eam signat aqua*). (*b*) In *De Spectaculis* iv (*c.* 197) 'our seal' (*signaculum nostrum*) is connected with the profession of faith made when entering the water; and (*c*) in chap. xxiv of the same work we read of "that pomp of the devil which in the seal of faith (*in signaculo fidei*) we abjure." (*d*) *De Baptismo* vi (*c.* 198-200): "The washing away of sins which faith obtains when it has been sealed (*obsignata*) in Father and Son and Holy Spirit"; and (*e*) in chap. xiii of the same work 'the seal (*obsignatio*) of baptism' is described as "a kind of vesture of faith which before was naked." These five passages, all occurring in treatises written about the same time, hang together; and if there were any doubt at all about the use of 'seal' in the last four it is made explicit in (*a*). On the other hand, *in a later treatise*, *De Resurrectione Carnis* viii (*post* 212), the phrase 'caro signatur ut anima muniatur' refers to signing with the cross, as distinct from water-baptism or unction or imposition of the hand. (The dates of these several treatises are taken from B. Steidle, *Patrologia.*) I have not come across any passage in Tertullian in which he says that 'the seal' imparts the Spirit.

I submit, therefore, that the use of the term 'seal' as applied to Holy Baptism underwent a change towards the end of the second century and in the early years of the third, and that its application as in 'Hippolytus' and as a rule Clement of Alexandria to the laying on of hand or chrism or sign of the cross as distinct from the immersion in water is not the earliest use,[1] according to which it meant the baptism in water or the baptismal rite as a whole. In any case, the facts adduced in this paper render even more precarious the arguments of those who would interpret certain New Testament references to 'seal' (*e.g.*, Rom. iv, 11; 2 Cor. i, 22; Eph. i, 13, iv, 30) as meaning what we now call 'Confirmation.'

On page 21 of his lecture Fr Dix argues that when, in the fifth century, the Latins substituted the term *confirmatio* for *signaculum* or *consignatio* the change in terminology was significant of a change of theology or of emphasis. May it not also be true that if 'Hippolytus' used 'seal' of the baptism of the Spirit as distinguished from water-baptism, he was departing from a more primitive use of the term, and that this alteration indicated a change in *his* theology or emphasis from what had preceded it? (Actually, 'Hippolytus' simply calls it 'sealing' when the Bishop makes the sign of the cross with chrism upon the candidate's forehead. Fr Dix (p. 12) speaks of "the whole 'sealing' by the Bishop," as if the term had a much more inclusive reference to all that portion of the rite that followed water-baptism.)

Certainly, Tertullian's words in *De Baptismo* vi, "Not that in the waters do we obtain the Holy Spirit" are abrupt and challenging. Why is he so anxious to deny the fact? Is it that he was conscious that some people affirmed it? In any case, if a trite observation may

[1] It is true that 'Hippolytus' claims to be holding fast to early tradition. But this claim can scarcely be taken to include terminology. In ix, 8 of the same treatise he speaks of a presbyter 'sealing' when he joins with the bishop in laying hands upon a candidate presbyter. Will anyone contend that this is a primitive use of 'seal'?

: forgiven, we are more commonly correct in what we affirm than what we deny. And it may be that the affirmations concerning e Holy Spirit that are to be found in the several Baptismal Offices the Anglican Communion will survive further scholarly examination to the teaching of the primitive Church. This article, as its title dicates, is not directly concerned with the origins of Holy Baptism. t since there is a tendency in the present controversy to work ckwards towards apostolic times, it is very important that the idence of the second century should be carefully studied. And if at is written here serves in any way towards that end, its purpose ill have been achieved.

J. E. L. Oulton.

A Call to Christian Action in Public Affairs

I have been privileged for the last year to have around me in riel College a strong body of committed Christians, most of them -Service men. We have met regularly in term time once a week d have tried, with a certain measure of success, to bring the Christian ospel to bear as fully as possible upon all the activities of our college e. But, like so many others, we have been alive to the sense of stration which Christians feel in the present-day world. It was not fficult, therefore, to persuade the group to read Victor Gollancz's *ur Threatened Values*, with a view to seeing whether we might be able do something to meet the threat and to extend our influence as hristians, not only in our immediate circle, but outwards into the orld at large. So it was that, in April, we decided that God would ve us organize a public meeting in Oxford which should be a call Christian action in public affairs. Driven on by a deep faith, and stained by prayer and worship and by our common fellowship e with another, and against all opposition both from within and ithout, we shaped our plans for such a meeting. On Thursday, ecember 5, our object was achieved and our faith seemingly justified. he meeting, as a meeting, was a triumphant success.

It was timed to take place at the Town Hall at 8.15 p.m. At 7.30 m., when the doors were opened, a queue had formed outside. nd by 8 o'clock the hall was packed and hundreds waited outside the pouring rain. An overflow meeting in St Mary's Church was rriedly organized. Soon, the church was also packed and many eople had to be turned away. In all it is estimated that nearly 000 people came to attend the meeting. These are significant facts hich might well be pondered upon by the leaders of the Churches nd of the political parties. No doubt some of those present had come ecause they were attracted by the speakers: the Bishop of Chichester n the Chair), Sir Richard Acland, Mr Roger Wilson, Mr Victor ollancz (guest speaker) and Miss Barbara Ward. But the exact urpose of the meeting had been very well publicized and most of hose who came had already received copies of the resolutions they ere to be asked to support. And in talking to people both before and

after the meeting it was evident that many would have come to it even if no speakers had been announced.

My main purpose in this article is to comment on what happened in order to help towards an assessment of its significance. But I must first give a brief outline of the facts. I was not able to be present at the overflow meeting—the speakers in turn went from the Town Hall to the church, where the Vicar, the Rev. T. R. Milford, took the Chair—but I understand from some of those present at St Mary's that what happened there was much the same as in the Town Hall.

Everyone present was given a copy of the resolutions. These resolutions were as follows:

1*st Resolution.*—There must be a large increase in the number of committed Christians actively engaged in public life; and church life must become an example of the application of Christian principles to everyday practical problems. We therefore resolve and call upon all Christians:

(*a*) to set out to acquire clear conceptions of Christian principles and their bearing on the actual problems of society;

(*b*) to play a full part (according to opportunity and ability) as working members of one or more of the national and local organizations upon whose healthy operation our public life depends;

(*c*) to give support by active democratic means to the government of the day in any attempt made to maintain the application of Christian principles in national and international affairs, and to press for a policy more and more in line with these principles;

(*d*) to do everything possible by example and by prayer to build up within the Churches a fellowship of Christians actively engaged in trying to work out in everyday life the social and political implications of the Gospel.

2*nd Resolution.*—In view of the special dangers which arise at this time in connection with our obligations to our recently defeated enemies, we urge the leaders of the Churches:

(*a*) to formulate, for the help of H.M. Government, a positive Christian aim which would govern our nation's policy, discussions and behaviour in all matters connected with our responsibilities for Germany, including our attempts to solve the problems of the reconstitution of German family life, of the resettlement of displaced persons, and of the assurance to German people of the economic means for a proper standard of living;

(*b*) to call upon Christians to see in appointments on the Continent unique opportunities of witness and reconciliation;

(*c*) to consider how far and where voluntary services on the Continent would be of value, and to negotiate with H.M. Government for the maximum opportunity to implement the results of these considerations;

(*d*) to continue and greatly to expand efforts to promote fellowship between the Churches in Germany and the Churches in the rest of the world.

And we undertake to acquire as much accurate information as possible about the present situation in Germany and the problems involved, and to do all in our power to make such information known to others.

By 8.15 p.m. the Chairman, the speakers and the platform supporters ad taken their places. There were present representatives of the urches in town and university, and of the various political, social d economic interests in Oxford: Roman Catholics, Anglicans nd Free Churchmen; Socialists, Liberals and Conservatives; the ayor and City Councillors; Trade Unionists and Employers; outh Clubs and Undergraduates.

The Bishop of Chichester began the proceedings by calling on all resent to stand for prayer. Here was a happy experience; Roman atholics, Anglicans and Free Churchmen, all were united in praying r God's blessing on the meeting and in asking for the guidance of e Holy Spirit; all were united in seeking His power to enable them play their full part as Christians in public life, and for the relief f suffering in Germany and in other needy countries; all were united saying the Lord's Prayer. Let those who are concerned with prob-ms of Church reunion note this fact. The desire for common Chris-an action transcends ecclesiastical differences and creates a common orship.

After the Chairman had read letters of good wishes from the Arch-ishop of Canterbury and Sir Stafford Cripps and had given his troductory speech, Sir Richard Acland moved the first resolution; Ir Roger Wilson, of the Society of Friends, seconded. Then the guest peaker, Mr Victor Gollancz, spoke of what he had seen in his recent isit to Germany. Miss Barbara Ward moved the second resolution, hich was formally seconded by the Chairman of the Oxford Con-ervative Association.

Both resolutions were then put to the meeting. There was some dis-ussion, and two of three proposed amendments were carried by verwhelming majorities, the third being rejected. The resolutions, s amended, were enthusiastically acclaimed with only one dissentient ote. The two amendments were, first, the addition of the word "economic" after the word "social" in clause (*d*) of the first resolution; nd, secondly, the addition of the words "and other needy countries" fter the word "Germany" in clauses (*a*) and (*d*) of the second reso-ution. At St Mary's Church both resolutions were carried unani-nously. And it is perhaps worth recording that when, in the course of y speaking at the close of the meeting about a "follow up," I asked s many of those present as were in a position to do so to send parcels f rationed foods to Germany, there was a striking response; nearly thousand people stood up as a pledge of their acceptance of this articular challenge. I have evidence that many, if not all, of those who so pledged themselves have already fulfilled their obligation.

The meeting was ended. It had indeed been a success. To quote from a leading article in the *Oxford Mail*: "The success of the Oxford 'Call-to-Christian-Action' meeting astonished even its organizers. Such an attendance—larger even than on the previous occasion when Sir William Beveridge spoke following the publication of his Report—in spite of atrocious weather is a most heartening sign. . . ." The speakers made no vulgar emotional appeal, but challenged the audience to a practical consideration of the resolutions they were to vote upon. The manner in which the resolutions were passed was, though without undue emotion, most impressive. The keynotes throughout were of calm, quiet determination and intense interest.

These then are the bare outlines of what happened. But there have been other similar meetings which have been equally successful—we recall, for example, the occasion at the Albert Hall when the late Archbishop Temple and Sir Stafford Cripps were together on the platform—and yet out of them has come not very much but frustration and disappointment. Are there grounds, then, for hoping that the "success" of this meeting may lead to any lasting and significant new life within the Christian Churches? Yes; I think so. And my conviction is founded not upon wishful thinking, but partly upon a careful attempt to discover the significant causes for the success of this particular event in Oxford, and partly upon an assessment of the quality of the meeting itself.

Let us, then, consider the causes for the success of the meeting which give rise to these hopes:

(*a*) The meeting was planned, organized and conducted as a full-blooded Christian venture. There was no deception practised. The audience knew quite clearly that they had come to take part in a call for Christian action in public affairs by Christians who would make no apology for their acceptance of the full Apostolic Christian faith. On the face of it there was ample justification for the pessimistic forebodings of those who thought the whole idea wild, and who expected it to be a "flop"—many had sincerely supposed that I was crazy to book the Town Hall for such a meeting. Not only is Oxford almost allergic to public meetings, however important the speakers may be, but also the general mood of apathy, the low ebb to which church attendances have fallen and the insignificant part which the Christians are able to play to-day in public life would seem to give little hope for a successful Christian mass meeting at the present time. At the Albert Hall meeting, to which I have already referred, things were different: Archbishop Temple had caught the imagination of the people and, in the grim struggle in which we were then engaged, the idea of a new age of security, a post-war world of fellowship, had become a popular expectation. Two great and then popular leaders of the Church and nation were assured of a large and expectant audience. To-day, the situation is wholly different. But it was because, in such a setting, we held no carrot before the donkey's nose that the success of the meeting gives ground for hope. Men have lost faith in humanism and they fear totalitarianism. They look for a power to save them. In this situation we may dare to hope that they

ill listen to a proclamation of the Christian faith which is in no ay watered down, but which has implications for the whole of their eryday lives.

We may not go so far as the writer in the leading article of the *xford Mail* already quoted, when he said "It [the meeting] refutes ie allegations that we are rapidly becoming a pagan people; it proves iat there exists among the public, and not confined to any one section, desire that Christian principles should be applied to all the problems life—personal, national and international. . . ." But we can see, th some degree of probability, that it shows a desire on the part many people to give Christianity a proper trial because they have st faith in other expedients. The fact remains that nearly 3,000 ople in Oxford expressed a sincere and sober determination that a ial should be given for Christian principles to operate in public fe.

(*b*) The initiative and drive for the meeting came from "below" id not from men and women of position in the Churches. Those who e frustrated may be excused if they despair after their emotions have en stirred by a hope that at last their supposed leaders are intending give them a lead and to enable them to release their pent-up ener- ies. But the case is different if it is the frustrated people themselves ho meet together to express their determination to discover by what mmon action they might let loose their pent-up energies and to nd the leaders who will guide and co-ordinate them. Frustration such a case may not lead to despair but to renewed and patient ope.

(*c*) Positive and practical resolutions, well publicized beforehand, ere put before the audience. People came, therefore, in a purposeful ood; and so they were in less danger than is usual at public meetings being carried away by their emotions. This factor gives ground r hope that the meeting itself, even if there were no "follow up," as of value. More than 2,000 people committed themselves to im- lement the resolutions. Here was a striking witness to a determina- ion of Christians of all the Churches and of different political party ffiliations to make their faith effective in the social, economic and olitical affairs of the nation—and as an earnest of their intention hey interested themselves practically in the German problems. s it too much to hope that leaders of the Churches and of the political arties may soon no longer be left in doubt about the mood and in- entions of the rank and file of Christians? I would not care to prophesy vhat may happen if they fail to harness this potential force and to elp it to achieve its aim.

(*d*) The whole of the organization of the meeting was upon the basis f personal relationships. There was and is no lopsided administrative ody responsible for it, and there is, therefore, no danger of the growth of another impersonal movement which would increase he risk of dividing the Christian forces. So long as personal relation- hips remain the basis of whatever may grow out of the meeting, here is every hope that it will have served both towards bringing various revolutionary elements within the Churches into co-operation

and also towards making use of the normal "set up" of the Churches to achieve its aims.

And there is another factor which calls for comment: no definite plans for a "follow up" were made. This might seem to have been a mistake. But it was because the meeting was unpretentious, having been organized from "below," and because it sought the official sanction of no ecclesiastical authority and received the official backing of no existing organization, that it has a better chance of leading to developments in accordance with the direction of the Holy Spirit—for we may believe that the third Person of the Trinity did not, as some would seem to suppose, cease to operate in the world except through the recognized and official channels after the Middle Ages. Though we made no preparations for a particular "follow up," preferring to wait upon the guidance of the Holy Spirit and having faith that God who had called us to this venture would be faithful, yet we did emphasize the necessity of being ready to follow in whatever direction the Holy Spirit might show after the meeting had taken place.

The significance of the Oxford meeting may, then, best be assessed by reference to the causes for its "success" and to its own quality. But when we ask the question "What next?" I am inclined to think that the only clear light so far shown is that we should strive to build "cells" of Christians in all parts of the country who will be prepared to be active in public life. Such "cells" would have as one of their aims to infiltrate competent Christians into controlling positions in the ordinary everyday life of the nation; in such a way they would influence the policy of our social, economic and political organizations in accordance with Christian insights, starting from the bottom in their local settings. To this end I am convinced that the keys of the situation are the avoidance, as far as possible, of impersonal organizations, the exercise of extreme patience, the insistence of personal relationships between the members of "cells" and between "cell" and "cell," and the making use of the existing "set up" in the Churches.

I would add one afterthought. The Oxford meeting is a warning for those of us who are inclined to be overpessimistic about the state of Britain in regard to the Christian religion; perhaps things are not quite so bad as sometimes we are inclined to believe. Maybe we are not alone amongst the prophets; perhaps, if we can bring ourselves to a greater degree of hope, we shall find that there are yet four hundred who have not bowed the knee to Baal.

L. J. Collins.

The Parables as Literature

The short story is an art form which every civilized nation has developed and exploited. It is at once the oldest and the newest kind of literature that there is—the oldest in that it preceded the written word. For stories were told long before they were written; and sagas or folk tales are the heritage of all great peoples. Only recently, however, has the short story come into its own as an art form to such

degree that there are writers in Europe and America to-day whose ort stories constitute their chief claim to fame. Tchekov, Maupassant, e and Katherine Mansfield made the short story their most constant ode of expression, with artistic deliberation; but in earlier ages it s often sought spontaneously as a means of expression by people o had never consciously founded a literary tradition. From China, m Arabia, from Palestine, the stories have come down to us— cinatingly alike in their burden of human enterprise and passion— d yet fascinatingly unlike in their perception of human values and ir verdict on human destiny. It would probably be true to say t you get in a nation's stories—perhaps occasionally a single story— bird's-eye view of its reaction to ultimate things that could never achieved in any other form; and this is astonishingly true of the ew Testament parables.

These gems of literature (for they are nothing less) are of tremendous storical, as well as literary, value. For they are a clue to the pattern day-to-day existence as it was lived by rich men and artisans in a ner of the world that literature has neglected and history over- ked. The great epics and tragedies of Greece—the satires and his- ies of the Roman world—give us this interplay of high life, and the ssip of kings and their scions—the rich pattern of events that led the rise and crumbling of empires—calamities, heroisms, battles d debaucheries; but if we turn from Tacitus and Thucydides to venal and Petronius we find that the personal focus does little ore than transform the panorama to the personal approach. In- rest is still the monopoly of the patricians and their dependants. e sordid background is just "roughed in"—unless, of course, some dy of rank turns prostitute or humour demands that a rake's progress ould drag him through the underworld of the capital. For the lebs, as such, were not interesting.

It is, therefore, something of a literary miracle that the New Testa- ent parables have been preserved for us. Like a still small voice nid the whirlwind, the fire and the earthquake, they make their uiet and colourful appeal for the lives of ordinary mortals. There s flashed across the page of history this sudden little glimpse of rdinary toiling men and women who hide their treasure, lose their lents, and sweep the house for it—give parties, buy, sell, transact; nd omit to fill their lamps with oil. The centuries between us are roken up and scattered. Some of them might concern an English illage in our own day—a story by Hardy or Bates or Coppard; nd yet an analysis of any one of them discloses an artistry that beggars me of the work of those who have come to be accepted as princes the art of the short story.

Consider the parable of the Prodigal Son. This is unique, no doubt, s a parable—a kind of Gospel in miniature; but it is unique also as terature—the greatest short story that the mind of man has ever evised. For not only is its construction perfect—development, limax and anti-climax in the form of a superb dramatic coda; but style, characterization and richness of detail, it meets the demands the most exacting critic. There is not, for instance, a single wasted

word; and what a wealth of emotional experience! For there is not a single experience known to the minds and hearts of men that does not find some corner in that story: love, hatred, fear, jealousy, anger, remorse, joy, relief, suspense, irony, humour (if we accept the picture of the rich young man being forced to feed the swine with husks as being ironic humour) and compassion. The list, of course, is not nearly exhausted and, in a few strokes of the pen, we are given the most devastating "close-ups" of the three types of men who people the universe: the Giver, the Getter; *and the man who neither gives nor gets, but keeps what he's got.* There are really no others.

Indeed, some vital relationships are here. For the giver and the getter (the father and the younger son) understand each other perfectly. There is not a single note of discord between them from the moment the boy makes his monstrous demand to the moment that he returns—derelict and repentant. That father *knew* he would come back. For "while yet he was a great way off" surely implies that he had been watching for him—watching perhaps every day; nor does that son argue about his forgiveness. He knows his father too well; and directly he feels the nearly forgotten "home" atmosphere around him he forgets that important little addition about being made a hired servant—forgets it or cannot bring himself to say it. The father that gave all that was asked now forgives all. He understood the desire for expansion and adventure which stirred in the other's veins; and now he knows the depths of his repentance.

Between him and the elder son, however, there exists an almost pathetic misunderstanding. They were kin without being akin—were of the same stock but had nothing else in common—least of all a common temperament; and that final scene between them leaves the puzzle unresolved. "Thou never gavest me a kid that I might make merry with my friends" produced no anger—not a breath of resentment in return; but only an almost bewildered retort "All that I have is thine." Was there ever such a tragedy as that lifelong misunderstanding between a father who would have given all (in spirit *had* given all) and the boy whose fancied injuries had blinded him to the bitter end? And how characteristic is their behaviour at this crisis! For the elder son had sent a servant in with a message to inquire what all this music and gaiety might mean; but the father did not send the servant back with a reply; *he went out to him and entreated.* There was no lack of love on the father's side even for the curious, puzzling and resentful son; and there is no reason to suppose that this son failed in love for his father. He had, however, completely misunderstood the nature of love and had retained at least only a sense of duty which without love soon shrinks up the soul. In fact he had lost the one thing which his brother had retained, and which was the saving grace that enabled him to repent.

This parable, then, gives us not only an epitome of the Christian religion, but a great masterpiece—probably the greatest masterpiece in literature. For the microscopic view of human existence (which, after all, has been the crux of all literary and dramatic art from the *Odyssey* to *Journey's End*) would just about fill a column in *The Times*.

a few hundred words the three types of character which people the orld have been superbly sketched, the whole gamut of human notions has been run through, and a philosophy of God and Man as been portrayed with superb artistry in the form of a story. It is impossible to say that one character is more important (for the story) less interesting than another; and its theme could be elaborated to at least a trilogy of novels and applied to any part of the world any stage of its history.

Other parables of the New Testament may be smaller in scope and conception; but all are perfect in their execution when considered literature. The delightful old king who, when his wealthy friends turned down his invitation, filled his house with strangers from the streets and gutters, and then threw one out for failing to come in the proper dress, may or may not be a theological puzzle, but as a human character he is superb; while the steward who turned and rent the debtor who nearly got into gaol by his default is an almost caustic comment on life; and the picture of those workers in the vineyard, who "supposed they should have received more," waiting to waylay their lord with a popular grievance, possesses a most infectious appeal that any camera-man would be proud to capture from a similar scene to-day.

The short story as an art form does, of course, lend itself to departments of thought and feeling. Its very size and the "close-up" nature of its approach to life necessitates this to a certain extent. Thus in the short stories of Tolstoy we get much of the dark, bleak realism of the mind of old Russia—and that streak of masochism in the Russian make-up which constitutes such a puzzle to the English and American people of to-day. In Maupassant and the typical French authors there is a sparkling agility which alternately laughs and scintillates. The thoughts, like the French words, *dance*; and even in its tragic moods there is something that mocks at life rather than endures it in the classical sense. Our own short stories, from Malory even to the pessimistic Hardy, display a robust sensibility—a kind of out-of-doors attitude to life which is generally on the side of the angels and prefers to regard evil as Fate and leave it at that.

The short stories of the New Testament make all these look a little partial and one-sided. For they grasp the nettle of life with such a daring assurance and lay bare the human soul from such a vantage point that we all suddenly see we are one. They achieve the purpose of an epic novel by a process that can only be described as "compressive intensity"—if it can be called a process at all. It is something that probably descends upon every literary artist when he is composing at a white heat of inspiration—knowing that there is far more truth in his words than he himself realizes at the moment of writing. In that great and terrible moment he realizes that something is being born—something with all its potentialities and capacities *in* it—ready-made. It is for other minds to unpack and discover what riches are there. In the parables of the New Testament these riches are perhaps greater than anywhere else in the literature of the world.

† Ashley Sampson.

Natural Theology

WHAT is to be done with these "Neo-Calvinists"? Are they, like the old Calvinists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, a menace to the integrity of our Anglicanism? Are they on the way to becoming a sort of Trojan horse or cuckoo in the nest, who will rob us of our Catholico-Protestant amphibiousness, spoil us of our long tradition of natural theology, drag us off the Via Media, make us cease to be a "Bridge-Church," and dump us down on the unmistakably Protestant side of the river?

To begin with the name "Neo-Calvinist," we may remark that it evokes some rather misleading suggestions. Neo-Orthodoxy or Dialectical Theology is, on the whole, more Lutheran than Calvinist in its Predestinarian doctrine. The parallel with the old Calvinists is also rather misleading. For Calvin as a theologian Hooker had a respect almost amounting to reverence. What he and his fellow-Anglicans opposed was Calvin's so-called "Scriptural" system of elders, and the attempt to substitute it for the Episcopal Hierarchy. When Calvin made his ridiculous comments on the Litany, they were ignored, as was also Baxter's even more absurd attempt to produce a new and better Prayer Book in a fortnight. Good, great and wise men can be very foolish sometimes, but we can, with our forefathers, distinguish between their wisdom and their folly, and give due attention to their wisdom.

It is generally admitted that Barth has done a great service to Christendom by recalling us to Revelation and to the Word of God. If this be so, it is surely worth while to hear what Barth himself has to say. Second-hand theology, such as you get in this article, is as dangerous as second-hand religiosity. We must be led on and back to the sources, and to the Source Himself. "Now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is the Christ the Saviour of the world." Which again reminds us that Barth is not the last word, nor even the first. More important than Barth or any other individual writer are the Creeds, Articles and Confessions of the Church, including that of Barmen. And they again are only of value as commentary and explanation of the Final Word of Holy Scripture, from which we begin and in which we end, since we take it as our source and our criterion.

We have now an opportunity to hear what Barth says in support of what many think to be his most heinous error, his supreme folly—his "rejection" of natural theology, and we have also an opportunity to hear what Brunner has to say in its favour. Peter Fraenkel has made a very readable translation[1] of Brunner's *Natur und Gnade*, and of Barth's reply *Nein*, to which Professor John Baillie has contributed a beautifully concise and pertinent introduction.

Till at any rate a few years ago, many in these islands were inclined to regard Brunner as a safer and soberer exponent of the "Dialectical Theology" than Barth. Barth does indeed go to extremes in his almost

[1] *Natural Theology*. By Emil Brunner and Karl Barth. Geoffrey Bles, Centenary Press. 6s.

matical determination to put everything in terms of justification by faith. His whole system of dogmatics is a systematic refusal to allow the divine activity of God's Word to be entangled with or subjected to any system or analogy. "By thee only shall we make mention of thy Name"—the Word of God is self-interpreting and self-authenticating; we cannot throw light upon the uncreated light, but must view all else in the light it gives, its function being to give, not receive light. So Barth (with Irenæus as against Augustine) seeks to understand created things from God, rather than to understand God from the things which have been made. His Dogmatics begin with the Trinity, but he does not try to deduce dogmas from the Trinitarian thesis. In characteristic fashion, he prefers to proceed from the way in which the Triune God has actually declared Himself, namely, from His Word. To deal in analogies is to sin against the Second Commandment, the function of which is to clear the way, to rob man and nature of divinity, in order that God Himself may be heard.

"Beati qui Deo vacare gestiunt." So the theologian and the preacher make way for God's Revelation by interpretation rather than by illustration—by saying *the same thing* in other words rather than the same thing *in other words*. If we get too interested in our illustrations we may find ourselves saying, not the same thing, but something else. How often have we heard preachers by their illustrations diverting attention from what they intend to illustrate, or by an excessive concentration on experiences obscuring the source of all experiences! Since Barth regards Revelation as a saving knowledge of the living God, and claims that only through God can God be known, we can hardly expect Barth to have any use for natural theology. It, on its own premises, does not claim to declare the one Word of God; it can claim to tell us about man's religiosity, of his speculations, not to say hallucinations, but it does not claim to be able to tell us the full truth about God. The Vatican Council asserted that God, the beginning and end of all things, can be assuredly known from created things by the light of human reason. But Barth denies that we can so divide the being of God as truly to know Him as Creator without knowing Him as Atoner and Redeemer. When we speak of Him as Creator alone, are we speaking of the True God, or of a mere abstraction?

Those who have not read Barth appear to regard him as almost exclusively, and certainly excessively, eschatological. Now I must confess that such parts of his works as I have read have made upon me a totally different impression. I had hoped for enlightenment in the departments of eschatology and prophecy, and for help towards repairing the ravages of liberalism. But I was disappointed. I found his views of eschatology and still more of prophecy disconcertingly weak and vague. It is the same old liberal landscape, only with a few changes in the lighting effects (plenty of chiaroscuro, and a few flashes of what may or may not be lightning) together with a few sound effects (which may be just the effects-man, or the roars of lions, or even what the Scripture calls "Voices").

When we come to the Church and sacraments, we find a strong doctrine strongly asserted. For Barth as for Calvin "Word means sacrament," and the sacramental doctrine is strongly based upon a strong doctrine of the Word. It is at least stronger than the sacramental doctrine of liberal Catholics. But an obstinate Anglican may ask the question "When once the echoes of Barth's voice have died away, as did those of Calvin's, what is likely to become of the Word and sacraments unless they are embodied in offices and liturgies, and thus made an everlasting possession?" (We mean to quote Scripture, not Thucydides.)

Nevertheless, in spite of any disappointments he may cause us, Barth never loses hold of his main theme, the supremacy of the Word. We may think some of his interpretations forced, as when he regards Jacob's wrestling as a resistance to grace, or represents "Cast not your pearls before swine" as a warning against a false view of justification, yet even if mistaken they are suggestive. We cannot fail to see that Barth, like Socrates, is following the Logos wherever it leads him, and the Logos he follows is the Logos Theou. He is right in subjecting himself to the Word, and when he speaks in subjection to the Word ("Under" the Word) he is right. He has found the one and only way back to theological Truth and authority. He does offer deliverance from liberalism and all other isms. He has stormed the central fortress. But of course a good deal of mopping up has still to be done, and not least in the realm of prophecy and eschatology. Some suggest that Vischer can give us better guidance here than Barth.

Brunner on the other hand is of the school addicted to "Christianity and . . ." Among the causes joined to Christianity by this conjunction (where continentals put a hyphen) are, besides natural theology, the "assured" results of biblical criticism, responsible parenthood (commonly called contraception) and Buchmanism! Barth on page 76 gets in a rather nasty dig when he says that the rejection of natural theology is "forced upon the exegete by the Creed (*e.g.*, by the clause natus ex virgine) and by revelation." This is a somewhat cruel reminder of the fact that Brunner rejects the Virgin birth. A further reference to John i, 13 may help the puzzled reader to work it out.

Of the controversy itself we need only say this much. Barth is angry and more than a little rude, because, unlike his opponent, he realizes the issues at stake. Brunner is a little puzzled by what all the row is about, and scores the best marks for controversial manners. But that does not prove Brunner right—Paul and Luther were neither of them very polite. Controversy cannot but become fiercer in tone when issues become serious and real authority is being sought, which may perhaps explain why, in times of crisis, the orthodox often sin more in this respect than the heterodox. The reader of this fragment will undoubtedly learn much from it. But in order to understand the subject properly, he will need to read Barth's *Dogmatik* II, i, 26, 2 as well as some of Brunner's admirable writings.

We have already shown how Barth does not so much reject natural theology as make it irrelevant by his doctrine of Revelation and of the Word. We will now attempt to approach the subject again, via

e thirteenth of our thirty-nine Articles of Religion. "Works done fore the Grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of his Spirit, are not easant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, ither do they make men meet to receive Grace, or (as the School-thors say) deserve grace of congruity: yea, rather, for that they are not one as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt t but they have the nature of sin." "Before" of course indicates a ical rather than a temporal priority. Did the Reformers then ny good works? Yes! They denied them, if considered as in any y meriting, evoking, preceding or conditioning grace. And yet ! For they affirmed them strongly as the necessary consequence a true and living faith, as the signs, fruits and results of grace. re we are considering grace as reconciling power, what the Bible scribes in words like "I bare you on eagles' wings and brought u unto myself" or "While we were yet sinners, Christ died for the godly." God in Christ through the Holy Spirit is the Agent, the ver. Man is the receiver, and can only be active in good works by ing passive to the Divine Action we call grace. Faith is a response God's initiative.

All this is old. What is new in Barth is that he takes the doctrine justification by faith, and applies it consistently to our knowledge God. "In thy light shall we see light"—"No man knoweth the ther but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." these words be true, then we cannot, by our reasonings or discoveries, repare for or contribute to or supplement the knowledge of God vealed in His Word, any more than we can by our good works ntribute to our Reconciliation. Revealer and Reconciler are One, grace as knowledge, the grace of revelation, is subject to exactly e same rules as the same grace in its other aspect of reconciling ower.

The controversy about natural law, theology and religion is thus en to be taking to-day very much the same place as did the contro-ersy about merit and works in the days of the Reformation. An ndependent, self-sufficing natural religion divorced from Revelation mere Deism, and powerless. So at least Barth thinks. So the real anger lies in a system where natural religion and Revelation are xtaposed, because if once natural religion is regarded as preceding evelation in any way, it becomes the foundation, and eventually evelation is judged and estimated by it. Once admitted as the ante-edent, it provides the axioms, premises and categories by which evelation is judged. Revelation ends by being subjected to it, and hen that is done, Revelation is no longer Revelation. The glory f the incorruptible God has been dissolved into general terms, which e can oversee and control, and is no longer that glory which God ill not give to another, but more in the likeness of a calf which ateth hay.

Just as in the sixteenth century it was pointed out that Scripture ommends good works, so it may be pointed out that the Bible con-ains statements which appeal to or relate to natural law. And now as then the answers may seem evasive. Barth has an answer ready.

He refuses to use the term "natural law." Abhorring this "Garment spotted from the flesh" he prefers to speak of the "witness of man in the kosmos."

Beside prophets and apostles we find this third inspired witness, the man in the kosmos. He speaks of natural things, he makes statements parallel with what is commonly called natural law, but he speaks not as the natural, but as the spiritual man, his witness is given from within the sphere of grace and of revelation. This is only to be expected, since God must reign over and the Bible speak of the whole of our life, not merely the religious part of it, but also what is called secular. The nineteenth and other Psalms, the Areopagus speech in Acts, the first chapter of Romans are therefore to be regarded not as antecedent to Revelation, but as its consequence and corollary. Their appearance in canonical Scripture tells us not of a law derived from nature, but of a law given to nature. Thus, after a certain manner, Barth does not reject natural law, in the sense of a law given to nature, but promotes it to a very high place indeed—when it has ceased to be natural and become spiritual and had a new name given to it, that is to say when it has been transformed into something entirely different.

What then of that natural law, or religion, which claims to precede or supplement Revelation? It can only be described as an activity of the natural man, a part of his unending struggle to fight against God, to resist grace and Revelation, to justify himself. Here again the parallel with doctrines of merit and of salvation by works is clear. The self-righteous man is at his worst within the Church, within the sphere of grace. The Pharisee, the merit-mongering Catholic, the judaistically legalistic Protestant have clothed themselves in garments of their own manufacture, which they fondly imagine to be the armour of God, or the marriage garment of the Lamb. We can commit similar offences within the sphere of Revelation, where we must continually be "casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."

Barth's attack on natural law, like that of the Reformers on merit, is thus an indirect one. At one moment he dismisses it as an absurdity, a mare's nest, an utter impossibility, the next moment he is treating it as a menace, a Trojan horse within the Church, and accusing its protagonists of treason against the Gospel. Those who think themselves to be Barthian in making direct attacks on natural law, or in rejecting it directly, show that they have failed to understand Barth. The decisive centre of interest is elsewhere. The decision to be made is not about natural religion at all, but about Revelation. And again, Revelation is not only a climax or culmination, but the one and only starting-point for any real thought about God.

There are many who praise Barth, while dismissing his attitude to natural religion as a mere idiosyncrasy, but in doing so they show how seriously they have failed to understand him. He has something more than a bee in his bonnet. Maybe it is a genuinely prophetic

e in his bones. He is pressing home conclusions derived from the ple, and envisaged by the Reformers in the sphere of soteriology, d is consistently applying them in the field of epistemology. It must clear that Barth's conclusions here are not partly false and partly ue: they must be either right or wrong as a whole. A further step s been made in the rationalization of theology, a door closed which Reformers left at least ajar, a new heresy discovered and defined. short, a great service has been done either to falsehood or to truth.

C. W. Quin.

Studies in Texts

CHRIST THE FIRSTFRUITS

Four sentences understood in relationship to each other have spired this incursion into the theology of a well-worn but abidingly portant theme. These sentences have been chosen because they at one in their use of the word '*re'shith*,' which in three of them is dered 'firstfruits' and in the fourth by 'beginning.' Here they are their order of appearance in the Scriptures:

In the *beginning* God created the heaven and the earth (Genesis i, 1).

The first of the *firstfruits* (re'shith bikkurim) of thy ground shalt thou bring into the house of Yahweh thy God (Exodus xxxiv, 26, and repeated in xxiii, 19).

Israel was holiness unto Yahweh, the *firstfruits* of His increase (Jeremiah ii, 3*a*).

But now hath Christ been raised from the dead, the *firstfruits* of them that are asleep (1 Corinthians xv, 20).

It is no accident that the word 're'shith' bears these two meanings. or is it without deep significance. The firstfruit is called 're'shith' t only because it is the first in time, but also because as the first is the best. It is not merely that which is reaped first because it ppens to have ripened first. It is that fruit which not only stands the archetype of the rest, but that which contains the totality of rest. It is the real beginning of the harvest, and is brought to the nctuary to be hallowed that the rest of the fruit might be hallowed it. In the making of it holy the rest is made holy too. This last int is clear from the verse from Jeremiah in which 'firstfruits' d 'holy' are plainly synonymous terms.

The bearing of this upon St Paul's use of the term is therefore minating. For what the Apostle writes he writes against the ckground of Hebrew religious thinking. For him the first Israelite one in whom the rest of Israel is to be found: in Abraham and in seed, actually present in Abraham, all the nations are to be blest. raham is the 're'shith' not merely in the sense that he is the first tual Israelite: he is 're'shith' in that in him the rest *are*, and in him ey are blest. This is a true parallel to the use of the word 're'shith'

with reference to the harvest, for here, too the whole harvest is in the firstfruit and is hallowed in the hallowing of the firstfruit. The whole Hebrew conception of the relationship of Nature to God the Holy One lies behind the language of the Apostle as it lies behind the language of the Old Testament.

If, with these ideas in mind, we turn to what two well-known Bible commentaries have to say about the Pauline verse, we find what seems rather surprising. Gore's Commentary, in which the verse is dealt with by Dr J. K. Mozley, says:

> Christ is risen and His resurrection is the beginning of the harvesting of those that have fallen asleep. Death came through man, and all men die in Adam; resurrection comes through man, and all will be made alive in Christ. There is a lengthier comparison between Christ and Adam in Rom. v, 15-21. We cannot exclude here the thought of Adam's sin, but Adam may be conceived as in himself 'a weak and earthly creature' (G. B. Stevens). The idea of representation *approaches* the idea of mystical inclusion. (Italics mine.)

Peake's Commentary has an article by its editor, who writes:

> Christ *has* been raised, the firstfruits of the rest of the dead, thus, as one with them, pledging their resurrection.

Can we not draw the conclusion that Dr Mozley is needlessly nervous, and that in this respect he presents a contrast to Peake? Can we venture the further conclusion that Peake has come upon the whole truth and expressed it without hesitation solely by reason of his saturation with the literature of the Old Testament? For there is no reason to believe that Peake was well versed in Patristic and Catholic theology. It can hardly be doubted that Catholic theology adheres to the bold interpretation of the words of the Apostle which Peake offers. How else are we to understand the vital doctrine of the 'taking up of the Manhood into God'? How else indeed understand the Pauline theology as a whole, and with it the doctrine of the rest of the New Testament?

That the Church of Christ is a Holy Church consists above all in this, that she is Christ's Church, ontologically One in Him and with Him who is the Firstfruits. This idea of the character of the relationship between Christ and the Christian as being an ontological relationship created in Holy Baptism, rejected in certain quarters as a Hellenic intrusion into the purity of Biblical religion, turns out to be Biblical after all. Not a little modern theologizing stands to gain from a greater readiness to appreciate more deeply Israel's life and thought, so faithfully reflected in the Old Testament. The supposed contrast between Greek and Hebrew strands in the totality of Christian dogma has been much overdone. Does not the shade of Harnack still obscure, and, equally, is not Barthianism in one of its aspects but Harnack re-writ?

E. Ridley Lewis.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. S. L. Greenslade is Lightfoot Professor of Divinity in the niversity of Durham.
Dr Oulton is Regius Professor of Divinity at Trinity College, ublin, and a Canon of St Patrick's Cathedral.
The Rev. L. J. Collins is Fellow and Dean of Oriel College, Oxford.
The Rev. C. W. Quin is Rector of Killinagh, co. Cavan.
The Rev. E. Ridley Lewis is a Lecturer in Religious Knowledge at ewland Park Training College.

CORRESPONDENCE

REGULATED EPISCOPACY

o the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Since Mr Bolton has recalled us, in your January number, Archbishop Ussher's proposals for a regulated Episcopacy in the nurch of England, and to the opportunities of those fateful years 41-1642, your readers may care to have before them the substance a pamphlet printed in 1642, now enclosed in a volume of Theological racts in the British Museum (702 d.8).

"Sixteen Propositions in Parliament, touching the manner & forme for Church government by Bishops & the Clergie of this Kingdome . . . and the opinion of the English doctors and divines at the Synod of *Dort*, concerning Episcopacy and lay elders."

1. Every shire to be a "several circuite or diocese"; except Yorkshire, which, on account of its size, to contain three.
2. "A constant presbyterie of twelve choyce divines" to be selected in every Shire or Diocese.
3. "A constant president to bee established as Bishop over this presbyterie."
4. This bishop in each diocese to ordain, suspend, deprive, degrade, and excommunicate, by and with the consent and assistance of seven divines of the presbyterie then present, and not otherwise.
5. Bishops to hold four ordinations every year, on the first day of May, August, November and February.
6. Bishops to be bound to residence in their own dioceses.
7. Each bishop to have a congregation in his own cure, to which he must constantly preach and minister.
8. Bishops not to be translated from one diocese to another.
9. For the appointment of bishops: "Upon every death . . . the King to grant a *congé d'élire* to the whole Clergy of that Diocese and they to present three of the Presbyters aforesaid, and the King to choose and nominate whom he please of them."

10. The first presbyters to be chosen by this present parliament; thereafter they to have power to fill vacancies in their number.
11. No bishop or cleric to have temporal office or jurisdiction except of probate, until Parliament shall resolve otherwise.
12. Every diocese to have an annual Synod at midsummer.
13. A National Synod to be held every three years, attended by all the bishops, with two presbyters from each presbytery, and two clerks from each diocese chosen by the clergy thereof.
14. "The National Synod to make and ordaine Canons of the Government of the Church," but these not to bind until they be confirmed by Parliament.
15. Every bishop to have a rent over and above his benefice, and every presbyter to have "a constant yearly profit above his benefice."
16. All revenues of bishops and deans and chapters to be reviewed and reported on at the next convention, and meanwhile no timber to be felled.

Then follows the declaration of the English divines at Dort against parity of ministers, over the names of Geroge Carleton, John Davenant, Walter Balcanquhall, Samuel Ward and Thomas Goad.

Without access to the Journals of either Lords or Commons, I cannot determine accurately in what form these propositions may be said to have been "in Parliament," nor can I speculate very far. But there is a rude resemblance, especially of numbers 2, 7, 9 and 11, to the Bill on Church reform (indorsed "The Bishops' Bill") read twice in the Lords in July, 1641; and number 14 may refer to the clause in the Bill for the appointment of the long-desired Committee, now of Sixteen instead of Thirty-two, "for the purging of the ecclesiastical laws and the squaring of them to the common laws of the realm." The Bill may be read in S. R. Gardiner's *Select Documents of the Puritan Revolution.* It looks like a product of the Committee of the Lords appointed in March, 1641, over which, as over its deliberative sub-committee, sat John Williams, bishop of Lincoln. And among "such as did constantly appear to lay their Heads together" was Ussher, Primate of Armagh.

The intention of the pamphlet, then, with its appended declaration against parity of ministers, might well have been to canvass the possibility of a form of government in which episcopacy was preserved and parity avoided, yet with the presbytery constitutionally established. (If the reverse is true, if the proposition and declaration had been meant to stand in opposition, the one departing from the orthodoxy of the other, the author would surely have argued it so.) Williams and Ussher were both persuaded that this accommodation was true to Scripture and tradition; they found no great intractability (according to Hacket, who was there) in the divines with whom they conferred: "all Passages of Discourse were very friendly between part and part." The plan was wrecked—and with it, Monarchy butchered, Church, Constitution and Common Law all thrown down—by mob rule as well in the Commons as outside, and by the deep Stuart fear that a

egulated Mitre" threatened also a "regulated Crown." The wreckers dead: the scandal of a sundered and disordered Church remains. not this the time, Sir, once again to canvass plans so painfully ntrived?

Yours faithfully,

HAWARDEN. G. R. DUNSTAN.

METHODS IN THE ELECTION OF BISHOPS

the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

In India and Burma there is a fifth method of electing a bishop, ich the December article does not mention, and which I believe be the most favoured. The electoral body appointed by the Council the case of the Dornakal Diocese this is the Standing Committee the Diocesan Council) votes by ballot for such names as have been ly nominated by five members of the Diocesan Council, either or less as they may decide. The Metropolitan may also nominate candidate. The balloted votes are sent under sealed cover to the tropolitan, who, with two other bishops, makes the final choice. e two bishops are appointed by the electoral body for the purpose. e canons and rules governing the election are perhaps unduly mplicated, but they do give opportunity for a democratic vote.

P. B. EMMET.

AT HALTON VICARAGE,
HASTINGS.
January 1, 1947.

BOOK REVIEWS

IE SOUTH INDIA CHURCH SCHEME. The Report of a Committee of Theologians. Published by direction of the Archbishop of Canterbury by the Press and Publications Board. 2s.

The Archbishop of Canterbury in a statement to Convocation on ay 15, 1945, indicated his intention to ask a body of theologians scrutinize the South India Scheme and to suggest improvements it. The group subsequently appointed under the chairmanship the Bishop of Derby has now made its report. They were instructed ot to question the general character of the Scheme as approved by e Lambeth Conference of 1930, but to indicate what theological d doctrinal amendments they considered to be (*a*) necessary, and) desirable.

Advocates of the Scheme will appreciate the sympathetic under- nding with which the proposals are treated, all should welcome e laying of some misbegotten ghosts and bogies, and no one will tarrel with the authors of the report for occasional sallies beyond eir terms of reference. It is hard to distinguish between changes hich are "necessary" and those which are "desirable"; and it is most impossible to comment on the proposals in detail without ference to the frame of mind out of which they have emerged.

For example, if the Scheme were being drafted now it would, the signatories hope, have been more Indian and more radical. "Instead of taking for granted the need to combine the 'contributions' of the Episcopal, Presbyterian and Congregationalist traditions, its authors might, in more radical fashion, have sought to go behind and beneath all these to a form of the Church as it appears in the Bible and in the early centuries" (p. 13). The suggestion here made is that the particular approach to Reunion reflected in the Scheme has been outmoded, in view of recent trends in theological research and emphasis on which scholars, alike on the Anglican and the Free Church side, are engaged. It is, in fact, the attempt to make a synthesis of post-Reformation traditions, which are all handicapped and distorted by the faults of the medievalism from which they were breaking away, which is responsible for the "excessively complicated system of rules according to which it becomes possible in theory for the Bishops to be over-ruled by the synod" (p. 15) in matters of Faith. The compromise about Confirmation, and the failure "to give explicit recognition to the important part which should be played in the forming of the corporate mind of the Church by the use of a standard Service Book" (p. 16) are cited as unfortunate instances of the attempt to make a post-Reformation synthesis.

A careful review is made of the statements in the *Basis of Union* and the *Constitution* on the Faith of the Church, and the emendations suggested (p. 21) should readily commend themselves to all concerned. The suggested recasting of the paragraph on the Sacraments (p. 22) is a great improvement on the section as it stands in the 1942 edition of the *Constitution* (II, 6).

The duties of bishops and presbyters are deemed to be satisfactorily stated, as is the wording of the pledge that congregations shall not have imposed upon them forms of ministry and worship to which they conscientiously object; but the clumsy synodical rules need changing by the introduction of voting by Houses, "the assent of each of the three Houses, of Bishops, Presbyters, and Laity, voting separately, being laid down as the prerequisite of any doctrinal decision by which it was intended that the Church as such should be bound" (pp. 29-30).

The Scheme has undoubtedly suffered, as a picture suffers, from too much tinkering and touching up. In that sense it has tended to deteriorate in its later revisions. It would be improved by the adoption of the findings of this Theological Committee, which are to be found in summary on pages 43-4 of the Report.

Some critics have been loud in asserting that it is a bad Scheme and would assuredly be copied in other parts of the world; but the fact is that the other schemes afoot seem to be fighting shy, as did Bishop Azariah shortly before he died, of the interim period of thirty years, and in this respect the South India Scheme is providing a warning rather than an example to be followed.

There is undoubtedly uneasiness in the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon, and the Diocese of Colombo is in a particularly awkward position.

"The difficulty will arise over the question of shepherding Indian

mil Anglicans from the Diocese of Tinnevelly and Madras, and alayalam Anglicans from the Diocese of Travancore, who come to ylon to work on the estates up country, or are engaged in trade or ployed as bungalow servants and so forth in the maritime pro-ces. At present they form an integral part of the Diocese of Colombo, ough it has not been too easy to make them regard this Diocese as ir home. Most of these thousands of Anglicans come from South lia, and to a very large extent from the Tinnevelly district. Would ean that they could no longer be cared for by the Church of Ceylon? ot, it would mean the introduction of another Christian denomina-into Ceylon, that of the Church of South India." (Bishop of lombo, *Some problems connected with the Scheme*, p. 22.)

The difficulty lies first in the fact that Christians migrate, and secondly the equivocal phrase "communion and fellowship." "The Church South India desires to be in full communion and fellowship with all Churches with which its constituent groups have had such com-nion and fellowship" (*Constitution* III, 14). As the recent corre-ndence between the Archbishop of Canterbury and Mr Owen tenbury, commented on in *The Times* of January 7, 1947, reveals, ll communion" can be interpreted in a non-technical sense of ndly exchange of hospitality, or in the sense that "full communion tween Churches needs a ministry mutually acknowledged by all as sessing not only the inward call of the spirit, but also the authority ich each Church in conscience requires." There will be no difficulty those who were in fellowship (in the former sense) with non-iscopal bodies before the inauguration of the Union, but what ll be the relation of members of the Church of South India who ss into north India or Ceylon to the Church of India, Burma, d Ceylon if the Church of South India is not (in the technical nse) in full communion with that Church?

The Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon may see a way through s difficulty, but if it fails to do so and if, during the next few months, uneasiness comes to the surface in some weighty public protest manifesto, there will be Church-people in this country who will only support the revolt, and that will be a sign that the Scheme, en at this late hour, should be drastically revised.

If the uneasiness is allayed and dies down, that will be a sign that Scheme should go forward, but in the words of the Theological port, "the limitations of the present Scheme should be acknow-ged, and the United Church should after the union make a . . . iberate attempt to submit itself afresh, in the light of the new know-ge, to the norm of the Church in the Bible and in the primitive iod, and then to consider how this norm may be renewed in the y different conditions of this age, and of this or that country" 14).

Edmund Southampton.

, The Close,
Winchester.

THE BIBLE TO-DAY. By C. H. Dodd. Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.

THE CHALLENGE OF ISRAEL'S FAITH. By G. Ernest Wright. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

Here are two books whose importance is much greater than their brevity might suggest, and to both a warm welcome is offered. Prof. Dodd's book offers to a wider public a course of open lectures delivered in the University of Cambridge. It deals in seven chapters with the themes: "The Bible: What it is," "The Approach to the Bible," "The Old Testament," "The New Testament," "History as Revelation," "The Bible and the Historical Problem of our Time," and "History and the Individual." Prof. Wright's book, which was first published in America in 1944, is restricted to the more limited range of the Old Testament, and deals with its theme in six chapters: " 'Thus saith the Lord': The Eternal in the Temporal," " 'Choose you this Day': The Meaning of History," " 'Obey My Voice': a Chapter on Terminology," " 'For I am thy God': The Living and Anthropomorphic God," " 'Ye shall be My People': The Covenanted Community," and " 'Behold, the Days come': The Outcome of History."

Both books make the fullest use of modern scholarship, and both treat the Bible as a book which is relevant to the modern world, since it is primarily a book of religion, with a message that is timeless. Yet both insist on the importance of history. The Bible cannot be understood as a corpus of ideas and teachings, save in relation to the experienced events out of which the ideas were born. Neither of the authors would ignore the many-sided work of modern scholarship on the Bible, though both would insist that a mere scholasticism is insufficient. In general there is much community of outlook between the writers, though Prof. Wright is the more influenced by the school of Crisis Theology. That he would not subscribe himself as a Barthian, however, is sufficiently indicated by the title of his fourth chapter—"the Anthropomorphic God." Prof. Wright confesses that so far as he knows his approach is neither liberal nor conservative, and the same is true of Prof. Dodd—though a recent American writer quite ludicrously charges him, on the basis of an earlier work, with holding "a genteel, refined 'fundamentalism' which has no affinity with modern scientific scholarship."[1] Both writers strike a prophetic note at times, for both have the burden of this age upon them, and feel the urgency of the challenge to contemporary society, not merely to believe that God has spoken in history and in the Bible, but to respond to His word by obedience.

Each of these books abounds in good things, and rests on wide learning without parading it. At not a few points they coincide in their positions, though they approach them along different lines. Both deny that individualism was born in the teaching of Jeremiah, and both recognize that individualism alone is an inadequate principle, while finding it to be an important principle that must be

[1] *Cf.* L. Wallis, *The Bible is Human*, 1942, p. 280.

asped alongside the principle of man's oneness with the society to ich he belongs in any satisfying view of life.

In his opening chapter Prof. Wright treats of the authority of Bible, and appears to reduce it to its power to speak to the heart conscience of men. This seems to the reviewer to be inadequate its emphasis only on the subjective testimony to the authority of Bible in the hearts of those who respond to its challenge by obedi-. There is also an objective testimony which claims attention de this, as Prof. Wright's insistence elsewhere on the importance istory should remind us. The message of the Bible was born in ory and led to history. It is interwoven in the texture of events. s not merely that the message is a philosophy of history that rests an interpretation of the past; often it offered an interpretation of future, and an interpretation that the future broadly justified. the inner and the outer testimony need to be firmly maintained he totality of a satisfying view of the authority of the Bible.

is unfitting to end this review on a note of criticism, when the iewer finds himself in almost complete agreement with the writers, would be happy if he could have said so well as they the things y have here said.

H. H. Rowley.

Manchester University.

E Origins of the Gospel according to St Matthew. By G. D. Kilpatrick. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 12s. 6d.

This excellent and interesting piece of research is the most important tribution to the study of St Matthew's Gospel which has appeared in glish since Bacon's *Studies in Matthew*, and will be read with atten- by all specialist students of Gospel origins.

t is particularly aggravating to the modern investigator that the gin of the Gospel which became the most popular and the most luential of all the Gospels should be clouded in an obscurity lit y by the enigmatic saying of Papias. In agreement with a growing sensus of critical opinion Mr Kilpatrick, after showing the difficulties proposed alternative explanations offered in order to uphold the rancy of Papias, supports the view that Papias was referring to Gospel of Matthew when he wrote: "Matthew composed the oracles he Hebrew tongue, and each man interpreted them as he was able." e Gospel was not, however, written by Matthew; nor was it written Hebrew or Aramaic. The reason suggested for Papias' errors is at his informant knew of the Gospel as 'according to Matthew' also of the objections to this ascription. To account for the ascrip-, and to deal with the objections, the hypothesis of translation introduced: from this results the statement that we have in pias."

The evidence of Papias proving a cul-de-sac, the investigator has all back upon the study of the Gospel itself. Mr Kilpatrick proceeds, refore, to explore the literary sources of the Gospel. He accepts generally accepted view that the evangelist made full use of rk and Q; but he rejects the view that the teaching recorded by

him alone had already been combined with the version of the Q material which he embodied. Rather was it already in existence as a *separate* written source, which can be called M, and which the evangelist sometimes conflated with his other sources, sometimes rewrote, and sometimes inserted in fresh contexts. The segregation of this M material from the long discourses in chapters V-XXV by means of linguistic and textual evidence is a fine piece of pure scholarship; and the student who patiently follows this close investigation will learn much in the process.

The *narratives* peculiar to the Gospel, which have long been regarded by critical scholarship as secondary in character, Mr Kilpatrick does not assign to a written source such as Bacon's N. He regards them as *unwritten* material which had assumed (like the M material) in the process of tradition a general fixity of form. The linguistic evidence seems to show that Matthew was the first to put this material into writing. "The indications of style, the obviously apologetic purpose of the passages, and the enlargement of the miraculous together favour a late date for the narratives, and suggest that the evangelist was the first to put them into writing." The milieu in which the special Matthæan teaching and narratives came to take shape was the liturgical customs of the Christian Church in the last part of the first century. These customs were based on those of the Jewish synagogue. The Jewish Christians took over the exposition of Scripture known as "Halakah, rule," and "Haggadah, narration." Upon the basis of the earlier written Gospel sources a wealth of exegetical material came into existence. The aim of Matthew was not to write a manual for the benefit of the instruction of catechumens, but rather to embody in a liturgical form this homiletical material. Certain Old Testament quotations had by general consent come to be regarded as interpretations of certain events in the Gospel history; answers to Jewish calumnies about the birth of Jesus and His resurrection had already taken common form; and sayings of Jesus, originally handed down in isolation, had been given different contexts by different expositors, and the differences had tended to become fixed. This last consideration accounts for the large number of "Doublets" in the Gospel—*i.e.*, sayings of an identical nature found in different contexts.

Mr Kilpatrick's view of the sources of the Gospel might appear to leave little room for much creative activity on the part of the evangelist himself. The author, however, a Christian scribe, writing not just as an individual but with the official encouragement and support of a Greek-speaking Jewish Christian church, has brought to his work an orderly mind, a genius for arrangement, and a sympathetic understanding of the nature of his sources, which make his contribution one of no mean order. Mr Kilpatrick thinks that he deliberately wrote under the pseudonym of Matthew, about the year 90, possibly at one of the seaport towns of Phœnicia, though the arguments for this provenance of the Gospel are somewhat thin.

The case for this view of the origin of the Gospel is built up on evidence which is cumulative; and all of it is not equally convincing

netimes alternative explanations of the evidence suggest themres. Thus the shortening by Matthew of the Marcan narratives y be due simply to considerations of space, and not to a desire to the material greater lucidity for public reading. On the textual the Western text is rather too eagerly accepted when it supports general argument. Thus at Mark i, 6, "we must omit the words d a leathern girdle about his loins.'" But why? It is true that re was a general tendency to assimilate the other Gospels to the of Matthew: but does not Mark present John as the second h in the light of 2 Kings i, 8 just as much as Matthew?

he liturgical element in the Gospel of Matthew has always been rded as *one* of the factors in its general make-up; the evidence of Lord's Prayer alone makes this certain. Mr Kilpatrick has now ed this element in the forefront, and seen in it the main explana- of the characteristics of this Gospel. His thorough and for the t part lucid statement of the evidence, on which he bases this clusion, will have to be taken into account by future writers on Gospel.

R. V. G. Tasker.

NG'S COLLEGE,
LONDON.

RTIN BUCER AND THE ENGLISH REFORMATION. By Constantin Hopf. Blackwell. 30s.

n a new book about Bucer the reader is likely to turn first to a ion of chapter I entitled "Discourse on 'Suvermerianism'". when the present rector of St Margaret's, Westminster, in the *Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI*, published in 1926, the word "Suvermerianism," hitherto unknown to English ature, in order to describe Bucer's theology, and especially his hing of eucharistic doctrine, he gave rise to some controversy. lay Canon Smyth, we may be sure, would discard the word vermerianism"; but it led him, according to Dr Hopf, into "some arious assumptions in reference to the theology and eucharistic rine" not only of Bucer, but of Cranmer also.

et the interest of the present work does not cease there. Having n consulted on that point, it will be found to contain much else should be indispensable to the student of the Reformation in eral and of the influence of German on English reformers in parar. Dr Hopf has attempted neither a biography nor the discussion theology. His chapters "are intentionally treated as separate ies," and not as a consecutive account. This only serves to bring more clearly how various was the influence in this country of a ble and single-minded man. Having briefly surveyed this man's and work from the moment in April, 1549, when, driven from sburg, he landed in England, till his death at Cambridge in ch, 1551, Dr Hopf turns to that doctrine of the Eucharist on which on Smyth has set such store. He acknowledges the quality of on Smyth's description of it, and agrees with him that it is neither heran nor Zwinglian. Bucer's aim, he shows, was, if possible,

to reconcile those two irreconcilable doctrines and at the same time to ground his own views irrefutably.

However, according to Dr Hopf, it is chiefly in his contribution to the revision of the Prayer Book that Bucer influenced the Reformation in England. His *Censura* figured prominently in the revision of the 1549 Book and suggestions of his for alterations and amendments were adopted in the Book of 1552. Next Dr Hopf considers *De Regno Christi*, the treatise in which Bucer sought to sum up his proposals for reform. Its teaching on marriage and divorce led Milton to call Bucer "the pastor of nations." *De Regno Christi* also expounded its author's proposals for poor relief, as well as views on usury which anticipated Calvin's, and here are called "vital and modern." Dr Hopf discusses, too, Bucer's correspondence concerning that vestment controversy which raged while he was in England, and his disagreement with Stephen Gardiner on justification and on obedience in Church and State.

Lastly, one-fifth of the volume deals with two discoveries of Dr Hopf's which are none the less valuable for having been, as he acknowledges, paralleled in America during the war. They are (*a*) that Bucer's Commentary on the Psalms furnished text for the notes in the Psalter of "Matthew's Bible" and that the arguments of the Psalms in that Bible are from Bucer; (*b*) that the English version of the Psalms in "Marshall's Primer" is that of the English translation (first published at Strassburg, 1530) of Bucer's Latin Psalter of 1529.

MONTGOMERY BELGION.

PETERBOROUGH.

THE REBIRTH OF THE GERMAN CHURCH. By Stewart Herman. With an Introduction by Martin Niemoller. S.C.M. Press. 10s. 6d.

Dr Stewart Herman is an American Lutheran minister whose experiences during the last dozen years have equipped him with a first-hand knowledge of life in Germany. He spent six years at "the American Church" in Berlin, where he remained in charge until Pearl Harbour; his last service there was on December 7, 1941. He was given a post-war assignment with the World Council of Churches, and was amongst the first to follow the American armies into Germany. He became a member of the delegation of the World Council which visited Stuttgart in 1945, of the first official delegation from the American Federal Council of Churches in the same year, and of the Mission of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Assistance (1945-46). Dr Herman has already published in his *It's your Souls we want* (1945) a picture of the struggle between Nazis and "the fighting church"; he now adds to this, and brings the story up to date by telling, in a characteristically anecdotal style, what he saw and heard on his return visit. His account ends on "VE-Day plus 365."

The author makes no attempt to hide the "bias" with which he approaches his tale. He deeply resents the harm "for which Germany has been primarily (though not solely) responsible in the course

two world wars," he would like to see an international organization ch can both punish aggression and prevent another such war, believes that the German people should be helped "to develop a ocratic and independent form of government," and he agrees the remark of Niemoller: "No peace can endure which does not e a hope of survival to the vanquished." It is in this frame that sets his survey, which concentrates attention on the Protestant ominations and deals most fully with conditions in the American e. Readers who wish to keep themselves informed of recent news ut the German Church problems will find this book particularly able in three respects: (1) his account of the Conference of Treysa, ch met under the chairmanship of the septuagenarian Bishop rm in 1946, describes the federation of the regional Churches, heran, Reformed, and Confessional, into the new "Evangelical urch of Germany" (*Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland*), which (he) will become familiar to us in the manner of modern abbreviations EKID; (2) his discussion of the confession of war-guilt which is referred to as the Declaration of Stuttgart does not fail to mention dismay which this document caused inside Germany; (3) he adds uments which are here made available to the general public the first time—the moderate paper by Pastor Heinrich Schmid of gsburg, "The Nazi Combat against the Lutheran Church"; ctives issued to the Gestapo for penetrating the circles of the visional Church Administration; the Archbishop of Canterbury's adcast to Germany in November, 1945, and Bishop Wurm's ly to it; the Report of the American Voluntary Agencies Mission nuary, 1946), some of whose recommendations appear to have n carried out since the book was written.

Dr Herman writes as a civilian, and he refers somewhat critically combatant soldiers, army chaplains and Military Government. t he also points out that the difficulties of an already complicated vironment have not always been lessened locally. It is perhaps unexpected that pastors who have found themselves continually gin' the government" for so many years should suppose that they d a right to make (occasionally irritating) protests to their con-rors; and the tense atmosphere of mutual suspicion which the tem of Nazi informers was sure to leave behind is not to be easily minated even from the management of Church affairs. In all this great contribution is unimaginable which Christians can make m without as well as from within a Church which, if repentant, s been born again.

W. W. S. March.

King's College,
London.

E Altar and the World. By Bernard Iddings Bell. Dobson. 5s.
UR Reasonable Service. By Anthony Hanson. S.C.M. Press. 1s. 6d.

The varying traditions within our Church are most true to themves, do in fact meet, at the moment when superficially they are st separated, at that moment in the Holy Communion when, all

being hushed with the awe that properly follows the saying of the Sanctus, all things now being ready, the ministrant proceeds to the central action of the rite. Here our doctrines divide us, and doctrine is very important, but we are united in what our doctrines are seeking to emphasize. We are one in our desire to mean every single word of the Prayer of Humble Access. We want to be humble before God our Saviour. Some of the rancour might disappear from our debates if we were all prepared to recognize in one another this common pursuit of humility.

For the reviewer it is the recognition of this note as the inner passion behind the many passionate things said by Dr Bell which gives to his book its distinctive quality and its value.

Dr Bell writes from the background of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, and the devotional commentary on the Holy Communion follows the American rite, the rite itself being conveniently printed at the end of the book. The commentary pursues the familiar pattern of interpretation which sees the Holy Communion service as being primarily a movement from man, through the Man Christ Jesus, to God—a great act of offering.

Undoubtedly this particular exposition is powerfully aided by the transposition, in the American rite, of the Prayer of Oblation from its position in the Prayer Book of 1662 after the Communion to a position which makes it one part of the great prayer of Consecration.

It is legitimate to believe that a similar prophetic concern for the relation between Sacrament and life marches at least as well with the order of 1662, which lends itself more naturally to a primary emphasis on what man receives from God through the Man Christ Jesus, in the strength of which alone has man anything to offer. We all actually believe both to be essential. We divide about which is most conducive to humble adoration and which shall therefore receive the main liturgical emphasis.

Perhaps one question may be allowed. Why has Dr Bell, in this moving book, for all practical purposes completely ignored the place of the sermon? Professor Dodd has recently reminded us how singularly appropriate is that common biblical metaphor "The Word of God." As he says, "By means of words, and normally by no other means, one person can affect another without infringing his personal independence." There is a perennial need in all sacramental worship for the reminder that God respects human personality, that grace freely given must be freely received. The preaching of the Word of God in worship bears more effective witness to this truth than does any other element in the liturgy. Devotional commentaries, be they never so prophetic, will reach only a few of the worshippers. They cannot be a substitute for the proclamation of the Word of God in the setting of worship.

Anthony Hanson's book on worship, *Your Reasonable Service*, admirably succeeds in what it sets out to do, to explain the meaning of corporate worship. It follows the form of an imaginary discussion between a Quaker lady, a young engineering student, a Presbyterian minister, and an Anglican vicar. A much stronger case could perhaps

made out for the Presbyterian form of worship, but that is not so portant as the real success of the book, which deserves a wide ulation and should lead to much profitable discussion.

M. A. C. WARREN.

NDON.

SHORTER NOTICES

Book of the Lover and the Beloved. By Ramon Lull. Translated by E. A. Peers. S.P.C.K. 5s.

his is a small, solidly mystical writing of the very first order of llence, and the translator deserves our thanks for rendering it ssible. In general, it constitutes a telling exposition of the remark t Francis de Sales, in his Treatise on the Love of God, that "love is abridgement of all theology," possessing as it does, all his ardour, with it the deep clearness of St John of the Cross and the hard good e of St Teresa. The Book of the Lover occurs towards the end of allegorical romance, written about 1283, which takes its name n the hero, Blanquerna. Blanquerna, renouncing the Papacy, res to a life of contemplation as a hermit, and during his retirement isited by a traveller, Lull himself, who asks him "to make a book ch should treat of the life of a hermit" for the benefit of his fellows Rome pursuing the same contemplative way. This he does, ting down daily the manner wherein he had contemplated God in prayer, the result being a series of vivid insights into the nature of soul's union with God, and the price paid by the soul for the joys betrothal to its Beloved.

J. K. BYROM.

ESTON-IN-WIRRAL.

ese Denominations. An informal introduction. By H. G. G. Herklots. S.C.M. Press. 3s. 6d.

Canon Herklots tells us that many groups of young people inside d outside the Church want to have sorted out for them "these ominations." And, indeed, there are signs that discussions on ese denominations" now take the place of those on "comparative gion," which used to be such a convenient way of evading the mand for a Yes/No verdict to the central claim of Jesus Christ. non Herklots makes a valiant attempt in 140 pages to compel se whose initial interest is "the denominations" to face the fact he Church. His little book is a thumbnail history of One Church, en in schism, apparently divided, made up of faithful, corrupt d stupid men, but always still the Church, the place where men et God in Christ coming to them in power and contemporary mand.

Many common misconceptions may be dispelled by reading s book. Several kinds of present-day fashions are by implication udiated: the tendency to mistake high denominationalism for gh Churchmanship, and the easy acceptance by those who ought

to know better of the military classification of Christians into C. of E., R.C., and O.D. Canon Herklots indicates with remarkable fairness the peculiar ethos as well as the doctrinal position of each denomination. Sometimes, as was perhaps inevitable, he uses a too ambiguous phrase to describe a complicated situation (such perhaps is his affirmation that Calvin's answer to the rule of the Pope was "democratic"); but his method of presenting what ought to be, but often are not, well-known facts will do much to dispel the sheer ignorance which he so rightly insists is a primary obstacle towards the attainment of the visible unity of the people of God.

There are other obstacles. It is necessary, but not sufficient, to speak of them in theologically dignified phrases like "the sin of Pride." We must learn to give specific content to this phrase. When Anglican Churchmen are arrogant, or Scottish Presbyterians pompous, or English Free Churchmen touchy (as they sometimes, though not always, are), it is for very understandable social (not purely theological) reasons. The reading of Canon Herklot's little book ought therefore to be supplemented by an extension of the kind of thinking that was represented in Richard Niebuhr's now seventeen-year-old work, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism*, unhappily never published in this country.

DAVIS MCCAUGHEY.

LONDON.

Ashley Sampson, R.I.P.

MR ASHLEY SAMPSON died suddenly just after this number of THEOLOGY had gone to press. He had been an indefatigable member of the advisory committee since 1939, and a contributor for several years before that. The Editor owes him a very large debt both for his willingness to help in every way within his power and for the fertility of his suggestions. It is chiefly owing to Mr Sampson that THEOLOGY has established itself on the frontier between theology and literature.

Few men had so many friends. He was a delightful companion. The energy that was stored up in his diminutive physical frame, and the generosity with which he would spend himself in the service of others, were wonderful. His friends will thank God for his steadfast affection and for his unfailing cheerfulness.

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher